Registered No. M. 382.

THE
Siddhanta Deepika.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE, SCIENCE &c.

FOUNDED JUNE 1897.

VOL. VII.] JUNE 1906. [No. 3

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
The Vedanta Sutras with Srikanta Bashya	A. Mahadeva Sastry Esq, B.A.	81
The Four Paths	J. M. Nallaswami Pillai Esq, B.A., B.L.	89
Cameos from Tamil Literature	T. Virabadra Mudr. Esq., B.A., B.L. J. M. Nallaswami Pillai Esq, B.A., B.L.	100
Sketches of Ceylon History	Hon'ble P. Arunachalam Esq., M.A.	105
Is Meat-Eating Sanctioned by Divine Authority	Sir. W. E. Cooper, C. I. E.	110
A Veteran Orientalist—Dr. G. U. Pope.		119

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION Rs. 4 (*Indian*) and 7 SHILLINGS (*Foreign.*)

FOR BONAFIDE STUDENTS Rs. 2 ONLY.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.—All orders for the Journal, Remittances of every kind, exchanges Contributions for Publications in the Journal, and all Correspondence relating to Advertisements &c. Should be directed to the Managing Editor and Publisher "SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA" Madras.

MADRAS:
PRINTED AT THE HINDU MISSION PRESS.

1906.

READ!

READ!!

READ!!!

Professor Max Muller Says :—

"Nor should their labour be restricted to Sanskrit texts. In the South of India, there exists a philosophical literature which, though it may show clear traces of Sanskrit influence, contains also *original indigenous elements of great beauty and of great importance* for historical purposes. Unfortunately, few scholars only have taken up, as yet, the study of the Dravidian languages and literature, but young students who complain that there is nothing left to do in Sanskrit literature would, I believe, find their labours amply rewarded in that field."

"But such Journals as......*The Light of Truth or Siddhanta Deepika*,...—have been doing most valuable service. What we want are *text and translations*, and any information that can throw light on the chronology of Indian Philosophy."

DR. G. U. POPE M.A., D.D. writes : To us Ancient Tamil Literature has always been a very favourite subject and in the high ways and by ways of Tamil poetry and legend, there is very much to reward the, sympathetic student."

"SAIVA SIDDHANTA PHILOSOPHY is the choicest product of the Dravidian intellect."

NOTE! NOTE!! NOTE!!!

THE ONLY MAGAZINE
Devoted to this Study
IS
The Light of Truth
Yearly Subscription Rs. 4.
AND
THE ONLY BOOKS
IN ENGLISH
ARE
Sivagnanabodham
OF
Meikanda Deva
Price Rs. 2-8-0
AND
Light of Grace
OF
Umapatisivacharya
Price As. 4.
TRANSLATED BY
J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, B.A. B.L.
and
STUDIES AND TRANSLATIONS
Price As. 4.
by
P. A.
and
Tiruvachakam
With Text and Translation and Notes and Appendices.
by
Rev. Dr. G. U. POPE, M.A., D.D.
Rs. 10.

THE

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

OR

The Light of Truth.

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

Vol. VII. **JUNE 1906.** **No. 3.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDANTA-SUTRAS WITH SRIKANTHA BHASHYA.

(*Continued from page 50 of Vol. VII.*)

FOURTH ADHYAYA.

FOURTH PADA.

Adhikarana 1.

On reaching (the Supreme Light), there is the manifestation in his true form, as the Sruti says. (IV. iv. 1.)

It has been shewn in the last preceding section that those who have attained true wisdom, reach, by the path of light, the abode of Siva, the Parabrahman,—that abode which lies beyond the abodes of the Hiranyagarbha and Narayana, and which, being of the nature of the highest bliss, is known by the name of Svarga. In this pada, the Sutrakara proceeds to shew how, in the case of those who have

reached that abode, the manifestation of their true nature takes place. The Sruti teaches that he who has reached the Parabrahman,—the Great Luminary, the Supreme Light,—manifests himself in his true form: "Having risen from out of this earthly body, and having reached the highest light, (the serene being) appears in its own form."* Now a doubt arises as to whether this form which is attained by him comes into being at the time, or it has already existed.

Purvapaksha:—It has not already existed in him. On the other hand, since the Sruti speaks of this form being *attained*, it must be something newly acquired, like Svarga.

Siddhanta:—As against the foregoing we hold as follows:—When the Jiva reaches Brahman, his *true* form—similar in its nature to that of Brahman—which has already existed in him veiled by his sin, manifests itself on the removal of the sin. So we understand from the words "in its own form;" otherwise, the qualification "own form" will have no meaning, inasmuch as even the newly acquired form belongs alike to the Jiva. On the contrary, as we maintain, when the sin veiling the *true* nature of the Jiva has been removed by the Grace of Siva, the Parabrahman who is gracious to all, the *true* nature of the Atman, similar to the nature of Siva, comes into manifestation; it is not newly brought into existence, as the result of an act is. Since the Jiva's sin has existed from time without beginning, we can easily understand how he is subject to samsara or mundane life. Wherefore we conclude that when the Jiva is liberated, it is his true inherent nature, the pure consciousness and bliss endued with omniscience and other such attributes,—which bursts forth into manifestation.

(It is) the liberated one (that attains his true form), (as shewn by) the original proposition. (IV. iv. 2.)

Though the Atman in himself has already existed, we maintain that, when the Jiva is freed from sin, the infinite bliss and the like manifest themselves in him; for, in the words "I shall explain him (the true self) further to you," the Sruti proposes to treat of him alone who is released from the waking and other states of consciousness brought about by sin.

* Chha. 8-3-4.

Moreover,

The Atman (is meant here,) as shewn by the context. (IV. iv. 3.)

From the context we understand that the Sruti, in the words "I shall explain him further to you," proposes to treat of the Atman free from all sins, who forms the subject of the discourse; for, the Sruti starts with the words. "The Atman who is free from sin,...He it is that we must search out, He it is that we must try to understand," and says further on "I shall explain him to you further." Wherefore, we conclude that the liberated Atman, in whom the inherent attribute of sinlessness and the like have manifested themselves, is of a nature and attributes similar to those of Brahman.

Adhikarana 2.

Because (the liberated one) is found described without distinction. (IV. iv. 4.)

It has been said in the last adhikarana that the nature and attributes of the liberated one are similar to those of Brahman. Now, we have to enquire whether this similarity of the liberated (soul to Brahman) is consistent or not.

Purvapaksha:—Which of the two seems at first sight to be the case? It would seem that none of the souls, whether bound or liberated, can be similar to Brahman, inasmuch as the Sruti denies a second being similar to Brahman, in the passages like "Rudra is one and remains without a second."

Siddhanta:—As against the foregoing we state our conclusion as follows:—There does exist a similarity between Brahman and the liberated soul.—How?—For, in such passages as "The sinless one attains greatest similarity," and "the liberated one becomes equal to Siva," we find it taught that the liberated soul is similar to Brahman in nature and attributes; and it is this similarity that is taught by the Sruti in the words "He that knows Brahman becomes the very Brahman." The liberated Atman, in virtue of this similarity being attained, realises himself as inseparate in nature from Arahman. As to the allegation that the Sruti denies similarity in the words "Rudra is one and remains without a second," it has reference to the fact

that the Jiva has no concern with the operations connected with the universe. The Sutrakara, too, says in the sequel, "as may be inferred from the similarity in respect of mere enjoyment." Therefore the similarity meant here refers to the attainment of all objects of desire equally with Brahman. Accordingly the Sruti says: "He enjoys all blessings, at one with the omniscient Brahman" Hence we conclude that the liberated soul can be similar to Brahman.

Adhikarana 3.

It is in respect of Brahman's attributes, says Jaimini, as the Sruti's teaching, etc., shews (IV. iv. 5.)

It has been said above that, when the soul is liberated, his inherent nature,—similar to that of Brahman, self-luminous and endued with the attributes of sinlessness, etc,—manifests itself. A doubt arises as to whether similarity in both respects is possible or not possible.

Purvapaksha:—The purvapaksha will now be stated by way of citing the views held by others.—Jaimini says that the manifestation of the true nature of the liberated soul, as declared in the words "he appears in his own form," refers to the attributes of Brahman, such as sinlessness, etc. It is these attributes of Brahman which are also inherent in the nature of the Pratyagatman or Jiva, as declared in the Sruti:

"The Atman who is free from sin......He it is whom we must try to search out, He it is whom we must try to understand,"

"He moves about there eating, playing, and rejoicing..."*

Wherefore, according to Jaimini, the liberated one becomes equal to Brahman only in respect of the attributes above referred to.

In respect of consciousness alone, says Audulomi, because that is his nature. (IV. iv. 6.)

Audulomi holds that the liberated soul is equal to Brahman only in so far as the inherent nature of both is consciousness (vijnana), as the Sruti says:

---

* Chha. 8-12-3.

"As a mass of salt has neither inside nor outside, but is altogether a mass of taste, thus indeed has this Atman neither inside nor outside, but is altogether a mass of consciousness" †

"He is nothing but a mass of consciousness." ‡

Thus, as we find both the views upheld, we have to conclude that the liberated soul and Brahman are distinguishable as well as undistinguishable; but, as they cannot be both distinguishable and undistinguishable at the same moment, we have to conclude that they are distinguishable or undistinguishable under different conditions of time, &c.

(*Siddhanta*) :—The Sutrakara proceeds to state his own conclusion :—

Though (the soul is) such, the attributes mentioned above do exist because of their mention, so that Badarayana finds no inconsistency. (IV. iv. 7).

But Badarayana maintains that the liberated soul is, both by nature and attributes, equal to Brahman, because there is no inconsistency whatever involved in the view. Though in the words, "he is nothing but a mass of consciousness," it has been taught that the liberated soul is self-luminous, still the Sruti proceeds to teach "The Atman who is free from sin,...must be understood," thus shewing that the attributes also mentioned above, such as sinlessness, pertain to the liberated soul. Wherefore, as the two aspects based on the teaching of the twofold authority are not inconsistent with each other, it is but proper to admit both. It is only in case of mutual opposition that an explanation should be sought for in the difference of the conditions of time, etc. Thus, we conclude that the liberated soul is like Brahman, self-luminous, as he is consciousness by his very nature, and that he is also endued with all excellent qualities, as it is declared that he is free from sin, and so on.

Adhikarana 4.

By mere will [he secures all enjoyment] because so the Sruti teaches. [IV.iv. 8.]

It has been said above that the liberated soul, who is self-luminous, is of unfailing will, and so on. Now a doubt arises as to whether this is possible or not

---

† Bri. 6-5-13. ‡ Ibid. 4-4-12.

(*Purvapaksha*) :—What is the view that first suggests itself ? It would seem at first sight that, in the case of the liberated soul, his mere will, without the aid of external causes, cannot secure for him the objects of enjoyment, since that alone cannot produce the effect.

(*Siddhanta*) :—As against the foregoing we hold as follows. By mere will, he can secure all objects of enjoyment, as the Sruti says :

"Thus when he desires the world of the Pitris, by his mere will the Pitris come to him."*

Wherefore, his mere will can secure for him all objects of enjoyment; there is no need for external causes.

And hence he has none else as his lord. [IV. iv. 9.]

For the very reason that he has attained to the nature of Brahman and is endued with sinlessness and other such attributes, he has none else for his lord; he is independent, never subject to Karma, since all karma has been destroyed. The Paramesvara does not control him, because he has gone beyond the sphere of the injunctions and the prohibitions which constitute His command and which have been in vogue in the long current of time.—How so ?—Because he has ceased to be a dependent being (*pasu*). And certainly, on the removal of sin, he has attained to the state of Siva Himself. His attainment of the state of Siva consists in his possessing all the unsurpassed blessed qualities free from the taint of all sin, —that is,—in being of the same nature as that of Siva. Now, the nature of Siva is made up of omniscience, etc. Therefore the liberated soul who is equal to Siva, has Siva's attributes such as omniscience, eternal knowledge, eternal happiness, perfect freedom, omnipotence, unfailing power, and endless resources. Samsara means the contraction of the self-knowledge (Atmajnana,) so that, when the sin, the cause of contraction, is removed, the liberated soul attains omniscience. For the same reason, when ignorance, the source of samsara, has been eradicated, the illusion also, by which the soul identifies himself with a large or a small body, ceases to exist. And because the liberated soul is devoid of decay, death, and grief, therefore, not being subject to karma, he is perfectly free. He is ever happy,

* Chha. 8-2-1.

because he rejoices in his own self, being solely immersed in the enjoyment of that unsurpassed bliss which constitutes his very nature; and he is therefore devoid of hunger, thirst, and so on. Because all his powers are ever unfailing, therefore his desires and his will are always realised. Hence it is that the liberated soul and the Paramesvara are spoken of in the Sruti as endued with the eight attributes, such as freedom from sin, etc. Wherefore it is but right to say that the liberated soul who is equal to Siva is perfectly independent.

Adhikarana 5.

Badari maintains absence (of the body); for so says (the Sruti.) (IV. iv. 10.)

It has been shewn above that the liberated soul is self luminous, of unfailing will, and so on. Now comes the enquiry as to whether the liberated soul is embodied, or disembodied, or both.

Badari maintains that the liberated soul has no such organs as the body and the senses; for, the Sruti speaks of Brahman as disembodied,—in the words "who is without parts, without actions,"—and the liberated soul, who is of the same nature as Brahman, must also be disembodied.

Jaimini maintains existence [of the body], because of the alternatives spoken of in the Sruti. [IV. iv. 11.]

But Jaimini holds that the liberated soul has a body, because the Sruti speaks of him as putting on different phases of existence with bodies and the sense-organs.

"He becomes one, he becomes three, he becomes five,"† and so on. Now the Sruti having spoken of the liberated soul as embodied and also as disembodied, a doubt arises at to what his true state is.

Purvapaksha:—The truth is that the liberated soul is disembodied; for, the Sruti teaches that he has no external organs and the like in the following words :

"Seeing these pleasures by the mind, he rejoices."*

† Chha. 7-26-2. * Chha, Up. 8-12-5.

And Brahman, too, is spoken of in the Sruti as devoid of external organs and the like, as one whose delight is in the Atman and prana alone, whose bliss lies in mind alone."* That is to say He takes delight in the Atman alone, not in any external object; He enjoys by the mind not by any external organ. Wherefore the liberated souls are ever in a disembodied state. As to the embodied state spoken of, it relates to the souls (in a state of bondage) whose conditions are different.

Siddhanta:—As against the foregoing view, the Sutrakara states his conclusion as follows:

Like the sacrifice lasting twelve days, both are possible, says Badarayana for the same reason. [IV. iv. 12.]

As the Sruti speaks of both embodied and disembodied states, the liberated soul exists in either way at will. So thinks the blessed Badarayana. Since the Sruti teaches both ways, the sacrifice lasting twelve days may be treated either as a *sattra*, or as a *ahina*, that is to say, either as a sacrifice in which a number of persons are engaged as primary sacrificers, or as a sacrifice in which only one person is engaged as a primary sacrificer. So, too, here. On the state of the souls who have risen to the height of Siva there is a pauranic text which reads as follows:

All-knowing, all-pervading, pure, all-full by nature, endued with strength equal to Siva's, gifted with supreme power, embodied as well as disembodied do they become at will." Wherefore the liberated souls may exist in either way.

(*To be continued.*)

A. MAHADEVA SASTRY, B.A.

* Tai. 1-6.

The Four Paths.

(*Continued from page 63 of Vol. VII.*)

The second possibility lies in the fact that God is not knowledge alone. If He was so, we cannot know Him for certain. But as we have stated above, He is also *all Love.* It is in this Supreme fact that our salvation is based. This Love is in us, surrounds us on all sides, above, below and all about us. His Love to us passes that of the mother, says Saint Manickavachakar.

The second possibility.

"சட்டோ நினைக்க மனத்தமுதாம் சங்கரன்"
"உருகிப்பெருகி உளங்குளிர முகந்துகொண்டு
பருகற்கினிய பரங்கருணைத் தடங்கடல்"
"நினைந்தொறும் காண்டொறும் பேசுந்தொறும் எப்போதும்
அனைத்தெலும் புண்ணெக ஆநந்தத்தேன்சொரியும் குனிப்பு
டையான்"
"தப்பாமே தாளடைந்தார் நெஞ்சுருக்கும் தன்மையினான்"
"அகண்டாகார சிவபோகமெனும் பேரின்பவெள்ளம்,
பொங்கித் ததும்பிப் பூரணமாய் ஏகவுருவாய்க்கிடக்குதையோ
இன்புற்றிட நாமெடுத்ததேகம் விழுமுன் புசிப்பதற்குச்
சேரவாரும் சகத்தீரே."

No selfish want prompts His love. His Love was ever with us from our first beginning to the very end.

"அருளெங்குமான வளவையறியார்
அருளை நுகரமுதானதும் தேரார்
அருளைக்கருமத்ததி·சூக்கமுன்னார்
அருளெங்கும் கண்ணானதா ரறிவாரே."
"அருளிற்பிறந்திட்டு அருளில் வளர்ந்திட்டு
அருளிலழிந்திளைப்பாறி·மறைந்திட்டு
அருளானவாரமுதத்தானந்த மூட்டி
அருளாலென்னந்தி யகம்புகுந்தானே."

The mother's love will not suffer even if the child misbehaves and does not deserve it. If we will therefore return His love, then our salvation is secured.

"அயரா அன்பின் அரன்கழல் செலுமே,"

St. Tirumular sums up these foregoing facts in a beautiful verse.

ஒன்று மிரண்டு மிலதுமா யொன்றாக
நின்று சமய நிராகார நீங்கியே
நின்று பராபரை நேயத்தைப் பாதத்தால்
சென்றுசிவமாதல் சித்தாந்த சித்தியே.

Love the greatest thing in the world.

Now let us realize to ourselves how it is that to know him and become one with Him, we must love Him. Let us take our human relations. Is it by birth and caste, wealth and possessions, learning and knowledge that one is brought nearer to another? Are not all these barriers dividing one from another? By all these means one regards himself as raised above all other less favoured individuals. It is learning that puffeth up a man. The 'I' ness and 'mine—ness' becomes more and more developed in these men. So these means can never lead one nearer to another. Then what other means have we? It is love, love in all its gradations from pity and upwards. This is the greatest Thing in the world as Prof. Drummond truly said. It is the ideal of both theistic and atheistic systems of the world.

Love is the basis of all human society, the rock on which it is built. That this will appear so from the mere heads of the chapters in இல்லறம் in the sacred Kural. It is the one thing which binds man to man, the parent to the child, friend to friend and the woman to the husband. When this prevails, the distinctions created by birth, possessions and learning all cease. It is this which impels the servant to engage in his master's service, the mother to sacrifice herself to the child, the friend to give his life for his friend, the lover to forget himself in the loved. All the noblest acts of heroism,

philanthropy and martyrdom arise from this one source. It is this love which as we have seen gives rise to the other great fact in Being namely sacrifice. Even naturalists have discovered the connection of these two facts, Love and Sacrifice, even in the case of lower animals. And should not this law hold good in higher realm than the animal and social? And it is to lead to this end we have all along been trying.

And in this place the importance of knowledge cannot be ignored.

Knowledge necessary.

One has to enter a railway platform and watch one of the ever recurring scenes.

The compartments are crowded more or less. Fresh passengers try to rush into it. The persons impelled of course by their own comfort resist the intrusion. Actual fights ensue. Some of them try to get in somehow. They stand for a while. Those who have comfortable seats are pierced by their own hard heart and they pity and relent. A small space is found for the man who stands. They naturally soon after fall to conversation. They discover soon their mutual friends and relations and by the time they leave the train they become the most affectinate of people and the parting becomes a sorrow. Whereby was this mutual hate turned into love. It is by knowledge. We are ignorant, all of us, how intimately we are related to each other. We are all god's servants, His children in fact and may be we can share in His fellowship. The whole world is ensouled by Him. We are members of His body. Says Srikanta.

The True worship.

"Wherefore the whole universe is ensouled by Siva. If any embodied being whatsoever be subjected to constraint, it will be quite repugnant to the eight bodied Lord; as to this there is no doubt. Doing good to all, kindness to all, affording shelter to all, this they hold as the worshipping of Siva."

Here in this last sentence of Srikanta, do we get at the real essence of all religion. What is Siva? It is Love. What is worship of Him, Loving Him. How can we love Him, whom we do not know? Nay we can know Him and do know him though. We do not perceive each other's souls or minds and yet we love each other. It is the body we know and it is on each other's body we manifest all our love. We do willing service to the body only of our elders, masters and teachers and parents. It is on that body we love, we lavish all our wealth and labour. So can we worship and love Him by loving His Body which is the whole universe of Chetana and Achetana.

பூதங்கள்தோறு நின்றாயெனி னல்லால்
போக்கிலன் வரவிலனென நினைப்புலவோர்
கீதங்கள்பாடு தாடுதலல்லாற்
கேட்டறியோ முனைக்கண்டறிவாரை—
சீதங்கொள் வயற்றிருப்பெருந்துறை மன்னா
சிந்தனைக்குமரியாய் யெங்கண்முன் வந்து
ஏதங்களறுத் தெமையாண்டருள் புரியும்
எம்பெருமான் பள்ளியெழுந்தருளாயே.

As I pointed out above, knowledge is an essential requisite of our love. As knowledge grows, Love will grow. The more and more we understand our nearness to each other and to God, more and more will our love grow. The knowledge and love prevailing between master and servant is weaker than between father and son; between friends it is higher and in the case of lovers it is highest.

I must here point out a Psychological Law which I may state as the basis of this experience and which I may state as the third possibility.

The third possibility.

It is the peculiar nature of the soul or mind, where it identifies itself with the thing it is united to. This aspect is alone fully

discussed in the Siddhanta Sastras. St Meikandan calls it அது அது ஆதல். St. Arul Nanthi expands it as சார்ந்ததன் வண்ணமாதல், St. Thayumanar paraphrases it as யாதொன்றுபற்றின் அதன் இயல்பாய் நின்று பந்தமறும்பளிங்கனையசித்து நீ. The human soul is a mirror—a crystal. It becomes dark when darkness covers it. A man can be judged by his associates. He can be good or bad as his associates are. With the world in union, the soul has become identified with the world and lost its individuality. In God it has become Sivam, losing its individuality. In the full glare of the midday sun, I challange one to see the mirror. What one will see if he has courage enough to see it, will be the full radiance of the glorious sun, and which will blind him at once.

Says Prof. Henry Drummond. "All men are mirrors, that is the first law on which this formula is based. One of the aptest descriptions of a human being is a mirror."

Professor Drummond states this Law as the Law of Reflection and Assimilation, or Law of Influence or as we may call it, Law of Identity அது அது ஆதல். He instances the iron which gets magnetised and becomes a magnet, "இரும்பைக் காந்தம் இழுக்கின்றவாறெனே" a mirror getting rid of its dust, reflects the glorious light and becomes *merged* with it and *lost*.

How the soul merges and loses itself.

Only one word about the meaning of the words 'merging' and 'losing,' before I continue the thread. I quote from a text book of science :—

"When a *river* enters the *Sea*, it soon *loses* its individuality, it becomes *merged* in the body of the ocean, when it loses its current and when therefore it has no power to keep in suspension the sediment which it had brought down from the Higher lands." Please reread the lines in this way and the application will become clear "when the soul loses its individuality (its feeling of I and mine) Ahankaram or Anavam, it becomes merged in God when it loses its karma, and

when therefore it has no power to keep in suspension its mala—with which it was associated from the beginning. This losing of self is the real sacrifice, brought about by love. It is this sacrifice பலி we are asked to make as we enter the Temple precincts and the moment we make it, our பசுத்துவம் will leave us and we will become நந்தி the Blissful Sivam.

We likened the soul to the mirror and the following passages from the upanishads may be considered.

"As a metal disk (mirror), tarnished by dust, shines bright again after it has been cleaned, so is the one incarnate person satisfied and freed from grief after he has seen the real nature of himself." "And when by the real nature of himself he sees as by a lamp the real nature of the Brahman, then having known the unborn Eternal God, who transcends all tatwas, he is freed from all pasa."

"From meditating on Him, from joining Him, from becoming one with Him, there is further cessation of all Maya in the end." In Drummond's language these verses read—see God, reflect God and become God."

Students of Darwin will have noted how powerful is the law of association and assimilation or identity in the animal and human evolution. Persons who are ever associated with pigs get piggy faces, and with horses horsey faces. In the case of a husband and wife, when they have been perfectly loving, it has been found, to effect a complete assimilation of their facial features சாரூபம். Such is the power of the human mind; it can lower itself to the very depths of the brute or it can raise itself to the very height of Godhood. This law is spoken of in our text books as the law of 'garudathyanam.'

This brings us to the very end of our subject.

We cannot know God really by all our religious rites and performances, repetition of prayers and formulas by saguna or

nirguna worship, with or without idols, and even by the highest yoga, except when His grace and Love fills us all and we lose ourselves in this Love.

Look at how St. Maikandan ridicules this idea of the Yogi that he knows God.

" If it can be meditated, then as an object of our senses, it becomes Asat. If you regard it as not conceivable by our organs (internal and external) even then it is of no use. If you contemplate it as beyond contemplation even then it gives you no benefit as it is a mere fiction. If you contemplate it as yourself, this is also fiction. Giving up these fictitious ideas of God, the only way to know Him is by understanding with his Arul or Grace."

The four paths.

So that all our understanding of Him till the final goal is reached will be merely fictitious, or use a better word, symbolical. The conception whether that of the Bhakta or Yogi, Hindu or Christian will only be symbolical. We introduce a real element into it when we introduce love in our conception of God. And this conception naturally divides itself into four forms, that of master and servant, parent and child, friend and friend and lover and loved. All other conceptions can be reduced into these four. There is love and knowledge in all these different forms of Bavana or Sadana. As our Lord and master, we do him and his bhaktas, loving service and obedience and reverence. In the master, we lose our own identity. To the father and mother, obedience and service and reverence and love in a greater degree is exhibited. To the friend we can say 'I am He,' 'He is myself,' 'all mine are His' and 'all his are mine.' In real life, this ideal of friendship is rarely manifested. Our people could hardly appreciate the act of the saint who gave his wife to the bhakta who demanded her of him. How would you like the Pourtrayal of Hall Caine of the lowborn and illiterate Manxeman who loved and continued to love more and more the

high born and cultured aristocrat who betrayed him, cheated and robbed him of his betrothed and forfeited all claims to regard respect. It was because his friendship on his own part was sincere and true.

It is this ideal of the friendship and the bavana required under it which reveals the meaning of the formulas of Tatvamasi and Aham Brahmasmi, given out as the mantras to be practiced by the Yogi. In Yoga, the identity of bavana is fully reached. When we understand this fully, we can understand all the episodes in the life of St. Sundara, who was of the very image of SomaSundara and whom God chose as his own 'friend.'

ஏழிசையாய் யிசைப்பயனாய் யின்னமுதாய் யென்னுடைய
தோழனுமாய் யான்செய்யும் துரிசுகளுக்குடனாகி
மாழையொண்கண் பரவையைத் தந்தாண்டானை மதியிலா
ஏழையேன் பிரிந்திருக்கேன் என்னாரூரிறைவனையே.

In life, have you felt the hundredth part of this love for your friend, the gnawing pain at heart when you are separated and the boundless joy when you met.

These are then the four paths or margas Chariya, Kriya, Yoga and Gnana, otherwise called Dasa, Satputra and Saha and Sanmarga. And the various duties assigned under each are only such as our love of the master or father or friend or lover will induce us to manifest in tokens of our love. These duties are meaningless except as tokens of our love and as disciplining us to love and love more God and his creatures.

என்பே விறகாயிறைச்சி யறுத்திட்டு
பொன்போற் கனலில் பொறியவறுப்பினும்
அன்போடுருகி யகங்குழைவார்க் கன்றி
என்போல் மணியினை யெய்தவொண்ணாதே.

These duties are for the Dasa Margi.

எளியன் தீபமிடமலர் கொய்தல்
அளிதின் மெழுகல்லகது தூர்த்தல் வாழ்த்தல்
பளிமணி பற்றல் பன்மஞ்சனமாதி
தளிதொழில் செய்வது தான்றுசமார்க்கம்

Our christian friends who regard our building Temples and spending in ornaments and flowers will scarcely realize why millions of money are spent on churches and church decorations. The money spent in flowers on Easter and Christmas festivities in churches comes to a million or more each year. Christ rebuked the man who held the joint purse and who objected to Mary's wasting that precious scented oil on Christ's feet. It was not the value of the oil that was worth anything but the love that prompted that sacrifice was worth all.

But it is not by costly gifts alone we can manifest our love. The duties of Satputra margi are as follows.

"பூசித்தல் வாசித்தல் போற்றல் சபித்திடல்
ஆசற்ற நற்றவம் வாய்மை யழுக்கின்மை
நேசித்தட்டன்னமுநீ சுத்திசெய்தல் மற்று
ஆசற்ற சற்புத்திர மார்க்கமாகுமே."

ஆதாராசோதனை யானுடி சத்திகள்
மேதாதி யீரெண்கலந்தது விண்ணொளி
போதாலயத்துட் புலன்கரணம் புந்தி
சாதாரணங்கெடலாஞ் சகமார்க்கமே.

are those of the Sahamargi. The eight forms of Yoga referred to are Yama, Niyama, Asana, Pranayama, Pratyakara, Darana, Dyana and Samadhi, and we note only here the definition of Yama and Niyama.

Yama is Ahimsa, Satyam, refraining from theft, celibacy or chastity, mercifulness, devoid of deceitfulness, contentedness, courage, taking little food and purity. Niyama is performing tapas, and japam, vratam, believing in God, worshipping Him, reading and meditating on the shastras, being cheerful, fearful of evil and intelligent.

The duties of Sanmarga are stated as follows.

பசுபாசம் நீக்கிப்பதியுடன் கூட்டிக்
கசியாத நெஞ்சம் கசியக் கசிவித்து
தெரியாத உண்மைச் சொரூபோதயத்திற்று
யசைவான தில்லாமை யானசன்மார்க்கமே.

These four sadanas are so arranged that one may lead into the other. And the forms and symbols in each are so chosen that as one reaches the higher path, fresh meaning and fresh beauty and life may burst forth, as his own intelligence and love ripens to receive the fresh life.

The Temple built of brick and mortar becomes the very soul and heart of the Yogi and the Sivalinga becomes the Loving Presence and Light of the Supreme. The food பலி offered by the devotee gradually comes to mean the sacrifice of anava or தற்போதம்.

The beauty of such books as the Tiruvachaka, Devara and Tiruvaimozhi consists in this that it furnishes the required mental and spiritual food to the illiterate and the most cultured minds.

That these four paths are natural divisions, it will be readily perceived. The world's great religions may be ranged under one or other of these heads. Mahomedanism and the ancient Judaism fall under the first division. It was the merit of Jesus Christ that he brought into greater prominence the Fatherhood of God. The following quotations from the Bible will show that the other paths are not unrecognized by Jesus Christ.

"Ye call me Master and Lord and ye say well for so I am." St. John. XIII. 13.

"If ye love me keep my commandments. XIV. 15.

Little children, yet awhile I am with you; a new commandment I give you. That ye love one another; as I have loved you that ye also love one another. XIV. 33. 34.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

"Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."

"Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what the master doeth, but I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my father I have made known unto you."

"Ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you. XV. 13 to 16."

"That they all may be one, as thou father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us."

"I in them, and thou in me that they may be made perfect in one. XVII. 21 and 23."

When I spoke of these higher aspects of Christ's teaching to a missionary, he observed to me that it only struck him lately that fellowship with God was a higher spritual condition than fatherhood of God. Among ourselves, the Madhwa system may be said to be pure Dasamarga. The Ramanujah in its popular aspects, is Dasamarga and Satputramarga and little more. Sankara's system will be Sahamarga. But the mistake is made in not understanding that these truths are only symbolic and then they are apt to become dogmatic. I have seen Christian friends contend that God is our real father, as Vedantis and Yogis may declaim that there is no other God but the self.

A true and universal religion will combine all these various paths and which are required and necessitated by the varyirg degrees of man's intellectual and spiritual development.

And then we will not see the mote in our brother's eye and will live in peace and amity for ever.

I only need quote to you one verse from the Gita where all these four paths are set forth.

"Therefore with bowing and body bent, I ask grace of thee, Lord and Adorable, as father to son, as friend to friend, it is meet, O Lord, to bear with me as Lover to Loved." I may also observe that Saivaism of to-day which I regard as the true modern representative of the historic religion of the Gita and Mahabharata period combines all these four paths and their great Saints St. Appar, St. Gnanasambandar, St. Sundarar and St. Manickavachakar are regarded as teachers of these four paths.

More than all this, I wish to emphaize the fact that love is the essence of all real Religion, and real worship of God is the worship of God's creatures and loving them one and all without distinction of caste or creed, as observed by Sri Kanta, and unless this is fully recognized and practised no real spiritual progress is possible.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B.A., B.L.

Cameos from Tamil Literature.

I. (KALITOGAI. ii. 1.)

The following is the first stanza in குறிஞ்சிக்கலி which is the second chapter in கலித்தொகை. The first peculiarity in the stanza is that it does not contain any Sanscrit words. The metre is கலி வெண்பா which, however, to the great surprise of the modern readers, is mixed with ஆசிரியத்தளை. Of course, the only instance of ஆசிரியத்தளை occuring in it would long ago have been converted into வெண்டளை and the metre would have been modernized if நச்சினார்க்கினியர் had not stamped his seal upon the peculiarity by a note. In line 16, தையால் நன்றென is expressly stated to be ஆசிரியத்தளை by நச்சினார்க்கினியர் in his notes to the stanza and if it had not been for this learned note, the manuscripts would centuries ago have been changed by introducing an அளபெடை to தையால் as தையாஅல் நன்றென்று which would make வெண்டளை which is the only தளை now admissible in கலிவெண்பா.

The context of the stanza is this. The தோழி (maid) explains to her mistress, the heroine, a false incident which she imagines has happened to her. In தொல்காப்பியம், such a liberty is allowed to தோழி (maid) in the Sutram :—

நாற்றமுந் தோற்றமு மொழுக்கமு முண்டியும்
செய்வினை மறைப்பினுஞ் செலவினும் பயில்வினும்
புணர்ச்சி யெதிர்ப்பாடுள்ளுறுத்துவரூ
முணர்ச்சி யேழினு முணர்ந்த பின்றை
மெய்யினும் பொய்யினும் வழிநிலை பிழையாது
பல்வேறு கவர்பொருள் நாட்டத் தானும். &c.

This Sutram very elaborately enumerates all the occasions when தோழி is allowed to speak. Her first duty is to conjecture the

intimacy of her mistress with the lover by means of நாற்றமுந் தோற்றமும், &c., being the seven methods enumerated above. After knowing this intimacy by the above means, then it is that தோழி, by false or real incidents or methods, should test her mistress as to the existence of the intimacy which she was able to guess by certain means and for this purpose she speaks to her mistress as in the following stanza. She might ask her mistress, for instance, to worship the young moon (see 'மைவார் கருங்கண்ணி செங்கரங்கூப்பு' &c., in திருக்கோவை.) The mistress might keep quiet without worshipping, and the inference drawn by தோழி on the principle of தெய்வந் தொழாஅள் கொழுநற் றொழுதெழுவாள், &c., is that she has got a lover, and therefore refuses to worship the moon. Or, she might say that she saw in the neighbourhood an elephant or a tiger with human blood in the mouth, which would arouse her mistress's fears for the safety of her lover. And so, by such methods as these, which may be real or fictitious, she sounds the mind of her mistress for confirmation of her suspicions of intimacy, before she countenances the solicitations of the lover who is hanging upon her for help in the matter. But, in the stanza here from கலித்தொகை, the தோழி invents a new fictitious incident, saying a certain very handsome person was paying silent visits to her and that, as both of them were bashful to open the subject, she asked him to push the garden swing in which she was seated and while moving there, she contrived falsely to slip from the swing and fall into his arms. By her mistress's behaviour, after hearing this incident the maid might be able to understand the existence of intimacy which might arouse her jealousy.

கயமலருண் கண்ணாய் காணாயொருவன்
வயமானடித் தேர்வான் போலத் தொடைமாண்ட
கண்ணியன் வில்லன் வருமென்னை நோக்குபு
முன்னத்திற் காட்டுத லல்லது தானுற்ற
நோயுரைக் கல்லான் பெயருமற் பன்னாளும்
பாயல் பெறேனென்படர்கூர்ந்தவன்வயிற்

சேயேன்மன் யானுந் துயருழப் பேனாயிடை
கண்ணின்று கூறுத லாற்றா னவனாயிற்
பெண்ணன் றுரைத்தல் நமக்காயினின்ன தூஉங்
காணாள் கழிதலு முண்டென்றொரு நாளென்
றோணெகிழ்புற்ற துயராற் றுணிதந்தோர்
நாணின்மை செய்தே னறுநுதால் ஏறல்
இனக்கிளியாங் கடிந்தோம் பும்புனத்தய
லூசலூர்ந்தாட வொருஞான்று வந்தானை
ஐய சிறிதென்னை யூக்கியெனக்கூற
தையால் நன்றென்றவ னூக்கக் கைநெகிழ்பு
பொய்யாக வீழ்ந்தேனவன் மார்பின்வாயாச்செத்
தொய்யெனவாங்கே யெடுத்தனன் கொண்டான்மேல்
மெய்யறியா தேன்போற்கிடந்தேன் மன்னாயிடை
மெய்யறிந் தேற்றெழுவேனாயின்மற் றொய்யென
வொண்குழாய் செல்கெனக் கூறி விடும்பண்பி
னின்க ணுடைய னவன்.

Oh thou, of eyes like blue lotus, ponder over this incident. A matchless hero, as if he pursued the tracks of a strong elephant or other wild beast, adorned with garlands graciously woven and holding a bow, would for several days come looking at me and go. He cannot express the source of his cares but one has to understand it by remote inferences. I was sleepless with sympathetic cares. I endured pain of mind, though unconnected with him. He could not bear to disclose his wishes to me, nor would it be consistent with my modesty to tell him my sorrows for him. Without enquiring into this, *viz.*, my sorrow for him, it is possible he might fall a prey to his cares. I, therefore, induced by my distress of mind which has caused my shoulders to pine away, have done an immodest act, hear thou of sweet forehead. While moving in the swing situated near the fields where we drive away the parrots, I requested him, 'Sir, please push my swing.' 'Oh damsel,' he said, 'well' and moved it. I fell falsely upon his arms, pretending to slip from my swing. Taking

my pretence to be true, he took me up forthwith and embraced me. If I then recovering my senses should get up, he out of his kindness to me would tell me 'Oh thou of gracious tresses, please stay not lest others should know this.' I, therefore, lay long in his arms.

T. VIRABADRA MUDALIAR, B.A., B.L.

II. PALAIKALI. STANZA 14.

அணை*மரு ளின்றுயி லம்பணைத் தடமென்றோட்
டுணைமல ரெழினீலத் தேந்தெழின் மலருண்கண்
மணமௌவன் முகையன்ன மாவீழ்வானிரைவெண்பல்
மணநாறு நறுநுதல் மாரிவீழிருங் கூந்தல்
அலர்முலையாகத்தா ரெழிற்றிதனிச்
சிலநிரைவால்வளைச் செய்யாயோவெனப்
பலபலகட்டுரை பண்டையிற்பாராட்டி
யினியசொல்லி யின்னுங்குப்பெயர்ப்ப
இனியறிந்தேனது துனியாகுதலே!
பொருளல்லாற்பொருளுமுண்டோவெனயாழநின்
மருளிகொண்மடநோக்க மயக்கப்பட்டயர்த்தாயோ?
காதலாரெவன்செயப் பொருளில்லாதார்க்கென
ஏதிலார்கூறுஞ்சொற்பொருளாகமதித்தாயோ?
செம்மையினிகந்தொரீஇ இப்பொருள்செய்வார்க்கப்பொருள்
இம்மையுமறுமையும்பகையாவதறியாயோ?
அதனால்
நம்மையும்பொருளாக†மதித்தீத்தைநம்முணுங்
கவவுக்கைவிடப்பெறும்பொருட்டிறத்
தவவுக்கைவிடுதல் அதுமனும்பொருளோ.

---

* மருள் = உவமஉருபு.

† மதித்தீத்தை = மதியென்றுமுற்றிலேயேவற்றிரிசொல்.

THE DEPARTING LOVER GETS INCREASINGLY TENDER.

"O Thou with shoulders softer than the softest pillow and more polished than the most shining bamboo!

O Thou with eyes black with pencilled dye more beautiful than a pair of blue flowers!

O Thou with teeth white and straight and more fragrant than jasmine buds haunted by bees!

O Thou with face, small and fragrant ?

O Thou with black hair loved by the dark clouds and a budding bosom

O Thou young maid covered with beautiful and bright bangles ?"

Such were the sweet flowers of rhetoric with which you beguiled me lately, and covered your hate to plunge me in sorrow.

(LOVE BECOMES YOU BETTER THAN WEALTH AND AMBITION.)

Did you forget your love by fancying wrongly with the vain delusion that nothing else is of consequence than wealth ?

Did you fancy the words of false friends that " where can love be without money" as true ?

Do you not know that money earned wrongly is soon lost and does mischief in this world and hereafter ?

Hence ;

Regard my love as worth something. Give up the search for wealth, as it will involve the loss of our love. And this will last you more than mere wealth.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B.A., B.L.

SKETCHES OF CEYLON HISTORY.

BY

HON'BLE P. ARUNACHALAM, M.A. CANTAB.

Barrister-at-law, Lincoln's Inn; Ceylon Civil Service; Member of the Ceylon Legislative Council.

(*Continued from page 76 of Vol. VII.*)

III.

The first historical event recorded in the chronicles is the landing of Wijaya, the discarded scion of a royal race in Northern India and the founder of the first known dynasty in Ceylon. This event is assigned to the year 544 B.C.,* about the time that Cyrus, the founder of the Persian Empire, permitted the captive Jews to return from Babylonia to Jerusalem. Over the period that intervened between the invasion of Rama and the arrival of Wijaya and which according to the Sinhalese traditions covered about 1,844 years, an impenetrable darkness hangs.

It has been usual to regard Wijaya and his followers as arriving in Ceylon from Bengal. There is hardly any warrant for this belief beyond the fact that his grandmother was a princess of Wanga (Bengal.) The traditions reported in the ancient chronicles of the *Dipawansa* and *Mahawansa* point rather to Guzerat in the Bombay Presidency as his country of origin and departure. The princess of Bengal is reputed to have run away from home and joined a caravan, and while travelling in a wilderness in the "Lala-rata," (the old name of Guzerat) was carried off by "a lion," probably a bandit of the woods, with whom she lived in a cave, bearing him a son and a daughter. When they grew up, they ran away with their mother. The lion roamed the villages, to the terror of the inhabitants, in search of his offspring and was finally slain by the son himself, a feat which is said to have earned for him and his descendants their name of Sinhala, the lion-slayer.† He then established himself as King of "Lala-rata," and Wijaya was his second son. He "became a lawless character" and had to be expelled by the King with 700 of his comrades and their wives and children. The ships containing the women and children drifted to "Nagadipa" and "Mahilarata," probably the modern Laccadive and Maldive Islands. The men landed at "Sup-

* The date of Wijaya's arrival is said by the Buddhist chroniclers to have occurred on the day of Gautama Buddha's death, which event tradition gives as 544 B.C., but which more probably occurred about 478 B.C., For reasons see *Cunningham's Inscriptions of Asoka.*

† The Sinhalese thus trace their origin to a lion, as the Romans of old traced theirs to twins nurtured by a wolf.

paraka" (the modern Surat in the Bombay Presidency) and at "Barukachcha," the modern Broach, and at both ports so misbehaved that they had to be expelled by the inhabitants. They took ship again and landed at last at "Tambapanni" in Ceylon. This port is located by some on the north-western coast near Puttalam, and by others on the south-eastern coast, at the mouth of the Kirinde-Oya. The Dutch historian Valentyn placed it in Tamblegam of Trincomalie district, in old times called Tamanatota and the sea-port of Tamankaduwa.

At the time that Wijaya arrived in Ceylon, it was inhabited by a race called Yakkhas or Nagas, of whom very little is known. They were a branch of a prehistoric, probably Dravidian, race which colonized South India and Ceylon. The term Yaksha, which is the Sanskrit original of "Yakkha," is in the *Rámáyana* and other Indian traditions applied to a race of spirits whose chief was Kuvera, King of Lanka, who was dispossessed by his half-brother, the famous Ravana, and is now regarded as the regent of the Northern qaurter of the world and as the god of wealth. The Yakshas were akin to, if not identical with, the Nagas, the Dragon race. They appear to have attained a high state of civilization, and the names of Negapatam in the Madras Presidency, of Nagpore in the Central Provinces of India and of the Naga hills, the north-easterly offshoot of the Himalayas, attest the wide extent of the ancient Naga dominion. Long before the Wijayan invasion Mahiyangana (now called Alutnuwara) in the Bintenna division of Uva had been one of their chief cities, and Gautama Buddha on his first visit to Ceylon is said to have descended on "the agreeable Mahanaga garden, the assembling place of the Yakkhas,"—a site marked by the ruins of a great dagoba built about 300 B.C., and still a great place of Buddhist pilgrimage. It was the *Maagrammum* of Ptolemy, who describes it as "the metropolis of Taprobane beside the great river" (Mahaweli-ganga.) The modern representatives of this ancient race are the fast dwindling Veddas or wild men of Ceylon and the Bhils, Santals and other wild tribes of India.

Wijaya on his arrival married (under circumstances* which recall the meeting of Ulysses and Circe in the *Odyssey*) Kuveni, a Yakkha princess of great beauty and much influence among her countrymen. With her aid he suppressed the Yakkhas and established his power, fixing his capital at Tambapanni, also called Tamana nuwara. He then basely discarded her for a Tamil princess of South India. Kuveni, seeking refuge among her own people whom she had betrayed, was killed by them. Another tradition says that the deserted queen flung herself, with curses on her husband, from a rock

called after her Yakdessa gala ("the rock of the Yakkha's curse,") and which is one of the hills that give picturesqueness to the town of Kurunegala. Tonigala, "the rock of lamentations," and Vilakatupota, "the vale of tears," both in the Kurunegala District, are also associated with her sorrows.

Kuveni Asna, which relates the story of her love and sorrows, says that in agonizing shrieks she wailed: "When shipwrecked and forlorn, I found thee and thy men food and home. I helped thee to rout the Yakkha's and raised thee to be king. Pledging me thy troth, thou madest me thy spouse. Didst not thou know then, that I was of the Yakkha race? Loving thee with unquenchable love and living in such love, I bore thee children. How canst thou leave me and love another? The gentle race of the rising full moon are now to me the blaze of a red-hot ball of iron; the cool spicy breezes of the sandal groves are hot and unwelcome; the cuckoo's sweet song pierces my ears as with a spear. Alas, how can I soothe my aching heart!"

IV.

Wijaya's successors, like him, were adherents of the Brahminical faith, and took their consorts from the ancient and powerful Pandyan dynasty of South India, whose sovereigns, from their enlightened encouragement of literature, have been called the Ptolemies of India. The alliance was indispensable for the development of Ceylon and was probably the justification of Wijaya's ingratitude to a Yakkha queen.

The cultivation of rice was among the first cares of King Wijaya. The grain was then not grown in Ceylon. When first entertained by the ill-fated queen Kuveni, he is said in the chronicles† to have been served with rice gathered from the wrecks of ships. Even 250 years later the production of rice was so limited that king Dewanampiyatissa is said to have received from the Emperor Asoka of Northern India 160 loads of hill paddy.‡ The Tamils, however, on the mainland had made great advance in rice cultivation. A branch of the Vellalas, the old ruling caste of Tamil-land, claims to have received the grain and instruction in its cultivation from the goddess Parvati,§ and still calls itself by the title of *pillai*, her children, for so she deigned to call them when granting the boon. The Tamil name of the grain (*arisi*) was adopted into the Greek language and through the Latin *oryza* has passed into modern European languages (French *riz*, English *rice*, &c.)

* *Mahawansa*, I., pp. 32, 33; and *Odyssey*, X, 274 *et seq.*
† Mahawansa, I., p. 33.
‡ Mahawansa, I., p. 46.
§ Consort of Siva and also called Uma.

Tamil colonies of agriculturists and artificers were imported in large numbers, and rice and other cultivation introduced. Irrigation works were constructed. In order to secure the organized and continuous labour necessary for their maintenance, the patriarchal village system, which still remains in a modified form, under the name *Gansabhawa*, was introduced. Large military forces were subsidized, and the highest offices of State thrown open to the new allies. The civil and military administration of the Island thus organized and the resources developed, Ceylon rose gradually to a high state of prosperity and civilization. The Island was divided into three great *ratas* or regions; the *Pihita* or *Raja rata*, so called from its containing the established (*pihita*) seats of royalty (*raja*,) and comprising the whole region to the north of the Mahaweliganga; the *Rohuna rata*, bounded on the east and south by the sea and on the North and West by the Mahaweliganga and Kaluganga, and including the mountain zone to which the land rose from the sea-coast like a ladder (*rohuna*;) and the *Máya* rata between the Dedura Oya and Kaluganga, the western sea and the mountain ranges and the Mahaweliganga on the east.

Throughout the twenty-four centuries of native rule rice cultivation was the principal concern of king and people and one of the noblest of callings. Kings themselves drove the plough. To build tanks and construct water-courses were regarded as the wisest and most beneficent acts of a good ruler. The extensive ruins scattered in profusion in the ancient kingdoms attest the bounteous care of the kings and the lavish expenditure of money and labour on the national industry, and the names of these kings live in the grateful recollection of the people as benefactors of their race and country.

Great as these irrigation works were, the greatest perhaps in the world, they did not altogether prevent famine in times of severe drought. The native chronicles report the singular manner in which a Sinhalese sovereign (Sri Sangabodhi Raja, *circa* 252 A.D.,) on one such occasion manifested his sympathy with his suffering people "Having at that time learned that the people were suffering from the effects of a drought, this benevolent king, throwing himself down on the ground in the square of the Mahathupa, pronounced this vow : 'Although I lose my life thereby, from this spot I will not rise until rain shall have fallen sufficient to raise me on its flood from the earth.' Accordingly the ruler of the land remained prostrate on the ground, and the rain cloud instantly poured down his showers. Throughout the land the earth was deluged. But even then he would not rise, as he was not completely buoyed up on the surface of the water. So the officers of the household blocked the drains

of the square. Thereupon being lifted by the water, this righteous king rose. In this manner did this all-compassionate sovereign dispel the horrors of the drought." (*Mahawansa*, I., p. 146.)

About 437 B.C. the capital of Ceylon was transferred by king Pandukabhaya, fifth in Wijaya's line, to Anuradhapura, the *Anurogrammum* of Ptolemy, originally founded by one of Wijaya's followers. The city organization was fairly complete and gives proof of no mean administrative capacity as well as advance in sanitary science. The king appointed his uncle "Nagaraguttika," the Mayor of the city. "From that time there have been," says the *Mahawansa*, ' Nagaraguttikas in the capital." Anuradhapura may thus claim to have been among the oldest Municipal corporations in the world. A great marsh was deepened and converted into a tank called Jaya. Friendly relations were established with the aboriginal Yakkhas, and their chiefs were given important offices. "He formed the four suburbs of the city and the Abhaya tanks and to the westward of the place the great cemetery, and the place of execution and punishment. He employed a body of five hundred *chandalas* (out-castes) to be scavengers of the city and two hundred chandalas to be night-men, one hundred and fifty chandalas to be carriers of corpses and the same number of chandalas at the cemetery. He formed a village for them on the north-west of the cemetery, and they constantly performed every work according to the directions of the king. To the north-east of this village he established a village of *Nichi chandalas* to serve as cemetery-men to the out-castes. To the north-ward of that cemetery and between it and the Pasana mountain, a range of buildings was at the same time constructed for the king's huntsmen. To the north-ward of these he formed the Gamini tank. He also constructed a dwelling for the various class of devotees. To the east-ward the king built a residence for the Brahman Jotiya, the chief Engineer. In the same quarter a Nigantha devotee, named Giri, and many Pasandaka devotees dwelt and the king built a temple for the Nighanta Kumbandha which was called by his name. To the west-ward of that temple and the eastward of the huntsmen's buildings, he provided a residence for 500 persons of various foreign religions and faiths." (*Mahawansa*, I., p. 43.)

(*To be continued.*)

Is Meat-Eating Sanctioned by Divine Authority.

BY

SIR. W. E. COOPER, C. I. E.

"And God said Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree in the which is a fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat."

To those who are seriously desirous of solving the "Food" question, these words will appeal with singular force. There is nothing ambiguous about them; nor are we left in any doubt. We are distinctly told in this chapter of our sacred Scriptures that although we are to *have dominion* over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth, the *fruits* of the earth only are given to us *for meat.*

This is the plain command of the creator. We are to eat of every herb and of the fruits of the trees, but we are not commanded to eat of the flesh of animals or of fish; the vegetable kingdom is expressly reserved and set apart for man's food: and this is a fact that cannot be set aside or controverted.

The eating of flesh by man, however, may be traced back to the remotest periods of history. In the eighth chapter of Genesis we hear of Noah offering burnt offerings to the Lord "of every clean beast and of every clean fowl," and it may be inferred from this that the practice of taking the lives of certain beasts and certain fowls had existed some time previous to his period. It may also be presumed that since man had resorted to the practice of taking the lives of animals, it was with the object of providing himself with food.

But it is by no means certain that, because man ate of the flesh of animals, and offered it as burnt offerings to the Lord, the creator necessarily *approved* of the practice.

Noah was one of the few survivors of a race that had been destroyed *because of its sins,* and it is conceivable that to take the lives of God's creatures and eat their flesh as meat was among the sins which were an abomination to the Lord, and which caused Him to destroy the human race.

We need hardly go back to Noah's days to realize that many false sacrifices, dedications and offerings are made to the Lord, which must be an abomination to Him; many an act and deed done in the name of Religion which is an outrage to His Holiness; much shedding of human blood and offering up even of human lives in the cruellest manner in the name of Christ.

For nigh two thousand years frightful tortures have been inflicted by man on his fellows; poor humanity has been persecuted,

hunted, imprisoned and slain with relentless cruelty and cold-blooded ferocity; and since the Redeemer walked the earth, man has succeeded in deluging the centuries with oceans of innocent blood poured out in His Holy Name. In comparatively modern times the terrible Inquisition swallowed up its countless thousands, and even in our own country, the prison, the faggot and the block have claimed their unoffending and helpless victims.

Noah, then, being human, was liable to human weakness, to the evil influence of inherited sin; to wrong conceptions of what was due to the Lord; to perverted ideas of the nature of true service, or of sacrifices that would be acceptable to Him.

Noah in common with his race, had been in the habit, probably, of killing certain "clean" animals for food, and as this form of food seemed good in *his* sight, he considered it his duty to make sacrificial offerings of it to the Lord. It does not, however, follow that Noah was right in his logic! It was contrary to the Creator's command to use the flesh of animals for food, and it is presumed that Noah must have been aware of this; yet, because it had been *his* custom to do so, he saw no harm in offering it sacrificially to the very Being who had expressly set apart the fruits of the earth for man's meat.

To satisfy the lusts of the flesh and pander to that sensual egotism which was as common in Noah's time as it is to-day, the express commands of God were set aside and considered of no particular moment in the economy of life.

It seems clear then that Noah sinned the sins of his forefathers, in this respect at least. And it appears equally clear that subsequent generations right through Biblical history simply followed Noah's example.

Many of the religious teachers mentioned in the Bible who "stood up for the Lord" were essentially human, and endowed with human tastes and weaknesses. They found the practice of eating animal flesh common among all peoples when they were born into the world, and they simply accepted it just as it stood. They were but *men*, and were liable to finite man's errors when he comes to interpret God's laws and commands.

They had forgotten that God cannot err, is not liable to mistakes; does not constantly change His mind as man does!

They had forgotten that, when God created this world in which we live, He made no mistakes and left nothing forgotten. And that among other things He made man and appointed certain of His creations for man's food.

God placed the entire vegetable kingdom at man's disposal, so that he might eat and be satisfied. But this did not satisfy him; he lusted after other meats, and in obtaining them he disobeyed one of the Creator's commands, and all the sophistry that man can bring in support of other interpretations of this plain command cannot alter the facts.

It would, however, certainly appear that in many of the books of the Bible there are passages that might lead one to suppose God approved of the practice. But if we continue to look into the Scriptures for further evidence on the subject, we shall soon find references of a totally different character, and a little study of the question will make it clearly manifest that there is a steady progressive development of thought in this respect running through the Old Testament.

In endeavouring to arrive at the truth behind seeming inconsistency, we must remember that the variableness lies not in the Will of God in the matter, but *in man's interpretation of it*. It is impossible that God's law of right and wrong in this respect, as in any other, could have ever changed.

Believing then as we do in the immutability of God's word, is it not incredible to suppose that this Omniscient Being, when planning out His marvellous scheme of creation, should have created man a frugivorous creature and have commanded him accordingly to eat of the fruits of the earth, and a few years later have changed His mind?

Surely this is not the plan upon which God works: surely He knows what He is about; and His word is more firmly established than the stars. To admit that the Supreme Being changed His mind is to invest Him with the attributes of man; erring, weak, changeable man; and as we naturally shrink from such a position we must seek for another solution of the difficulty.

It seems that an explanation of the seeming inconsistency is offered in the fact that Jewish historians have always regarded their Jehovah as a Personal God; and once we clothe the Creator with personal attributes, we make Him subject to human weaknesses. Such a conception of God may well lead the mind into all sorts of errors, and it certainly appears that, as the whole of the old Jewish writers regarded Jehovah as a Personal Being, and moreover as a God possessed of the same passions and attributes as man, they found it easy enough to believe that, as He was given to anger, jealousy, repentance and such like weaknesses, He might conceivably change His mind occasionally.

In other words, God was measured by human standards, and man utterly failed to appreciate Him; failed to arrive at a just estimate of His immeasurable greatness, of the awful magnitude of His might, majesty, and power; and of the profundity of His unchangeableness.

At the very earliest period of Israelitish History we find the people following the instincts of all semi-savage races by shedding the blood of animals and offering their bodies as sacrifices to appease the Being they worshipped, and it is conceivable that the rulers of Israel, in codifying the customs into some intelligible shape to meet the requirements of the times, only followed these instincts in giving to the people that wonderful code of laws which is to be found in the books of Numbers and Leviticus; instincts, however, which completely harmonized with their own tastes and inclinations in the matter.

Further on, as the people became more enlightened, we find less attention paid to the rigid ordinances laid down by ancient lawgivers. In Psalm li, 17-19, written by David about 1034 B.C., we find the following passage :—

"The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou will not despise."

Still later, about 760 B.C., we find the following reference to the subject in Isaiah, I, 11-14 :—

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats."

"When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?"

Such scriptures clearly show that, not only had the people no divine authority to offer these burnt offerings and sacrifices, but they were actually an abomination to the Lord. The Lord God of Israel is here asking by what authority these abominations were offered to Him; and it is clear that this must have had a potent effect on the Israelitish priesthood in checking these bloody sacrifices, as it will be seen from this time onwards that the cruel practice gradually recedes into the background, and finally disappears with the advent of the Redeemer. So much, at least, may be said as to the practice of using animal flesh by way of sacrifice.

The first chapter of Genesis perhaps stands alone among the many beautiful chapters of the Bible. It is not a biography of man, as is practically the rest of the Old Testament. It is an unknown record of God's creation, accepted as true by the Jewish peoples and by the Christian nations.

The remainder of the Old Testaments stands out in sharp contrast to this. It is a strange blending of God and man; on the one hand we have God as a Personal Being striving, struggling for the mastery of man's soul; pleading, beseeching man to be true to Him and not to depart from one who had been so good and merciful to him; and then threatening, cursing and punishing him; and on the other, a record of man's base ingratitude to his Creator, and of his vices, iniquities and crimes; and, alas! there is but little said of his virtues.

Bearing in mind the character of the race depicted in the historical books of the Old Testament, we may well be pardoned if we accept with many doubts the views held in those times in regard to the killing of God's creatures and using their flesh as human food; and it is perfectly clear that no justification whatever can be found in these books for the practice of meat-eating, but that the evidence is rather the other way, tending to show, on the whole, divine disapprobation of the habit.

But in turning to the Gospels of the New Testament, we have a new set of conditions to deal with, inasmuch as the interest at once centres round the acts and teachings of the supremely inspired Son of God, and pretexts in favour of the consumption of animal food are at once sought for and found in the examples supposed to be set by Christ Himself. The marriage feast in Cana of Galilee; feeding the multitude with loaves and fishes; and the partaking of the broiled fish and the honeycomb after His Resurrection, are all quoted as divine examples in favour of meat-eating; but let us examine the matter somewhat closely before we make up our minds one way or the other.

When the Saviour came among us, He came with no earthly pomp and circumstance. He took upon Himself man's estate, man's methods, habits and customs, including his ways of eating and drinking. It does not, however, follow that, because the Lord became man for our sake, He necessarily *approved* of all man's habits and modes of life. As a matter of fact, in the four books of the New Testament that record the life and works of the Saviour, and lay bare to some extent the simplicity and frugality of His domestic life, there is really no *direct* evidence in proof of His ever having partaken of animal food; no evidence of a nature, let us say, that would be accepted as conclusive in any human court of justice of to-day.

The most that can be required of us is to admit, for the sake of argument, that there is evidence, by implication only, that Christ may possibly have sometimes partaken of animal food. But as evi-

dence of this nature is of a *negative* rather than a *positive* character, nothing can be proved by it.

We find in St. Matthew xi, 19, that His enemies accused Him of being "a man gluttonous and a winebibber." In St. Mark ii, 15, that He "sat at meat with publicans and sinners" (the word here translated "meat" in the original refers to *food*, not *flesh*; the 'meat offering' of the Hebrews was one of the corn and oil;) while all the books of the Gospels refer to His feeding the multitude with loaves and fishes.

But the most that this discloses is the fact that He, to whom all things were possible, did not despise human habits, or human means of relieving hunger; nor did He hold aloof from them.

We must also remember that fish was probably an absolute necessity for the crowded population of Palestine at that time. And the taking of net-caught fish does not involve bloodshed and cruelty that is needless; therefore the consumption of this type of food is a very different act to the eating of the flesh of warm-blooded animals, whether considered from the ethical or the hygienic standpoint.

It is indeed conceivable that, conscious as we know He was of His divine origin, He must have experienced many things in His brief human existence that were repugnant to Him; suffered many a thing that caused Him bitter pain and deep humiliation, yet he gave no sign.

Not the least among those afflictions were those which the God-Man found in the daily routine of human life.

It is distinctly recorded by the early Fathers of the Church that several of the Apostles were total abstainers from flesh food, and it is more than probable that they were following the exalted example of their Master.

Looking at the subject from this standpoint, it would seem that the argument in favour of flesh eating has little to gain by any reference to the records of the life of Christ, and His attitude in the matter.

* * *

Two of the commonest reasons give in favour of meat-eating are:

1. That if God did not intend man to eat of the flesh of animals. He would not have given them to us.
2. That man's teeth are evidently intended for the eating of animal food; and if they were not given to us for that purpose, why are we provided with them?

In regard to the first point, there is, no doubt, widespread misconception on the question. It is believed by most people, who will

not think for themselves, that all animals whose flesh is considered what is popularly termed "good to eat" were really *given* to us by God for food. If for humane considerations it be suggested by some one that they should abstain from the use of animal food, the answer comes promptly, "Why should I? It was given to us for food, and why shouldn't I eat beef or mutton, or anything else I like?"

Then we frequently hear it contended that what we call the domestic animals "belong to man;" they are his property; he breeds, rears, feeds them; and if he kills such of them as are "good for human food," he has a perfect right to do so; they belong to him as rightfully as do his lands and house, and other goods and chattels, and he can therfore do what he likes with them.

Let us take the first of these reasons, viz., that certain animals were *given* to us for food. Now if there is a gift there must be a giver. The gift is the effect, the giver the cause. Who was the giver; and when, how and where, and upon whom was the gift bestowed?

We have seen that there is nothing in the Old Testament to prove that the Almighty God created any of the animals for man's food, but that on the contrary he was expressly enjoined to eat of the fruits of the earth; and to have, at the same time, *dominion* over the rest of the animal creation. Let us, however, pause a moment and consider what was meant by *dominion*. Did the Creator mean that dominion over "every living thing that moveth upon the earth" gave man the right to slaughter His creatures for food? Hardly that, or reference would have been made to it in the next verse:—

"*And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.*"

After so plain a command, the only interpretation that dominion might bear is its literal meaning—*lordship, power*!

God created other beings besides man, and as many of them were physically stronger than man himself, it was necessary that he should be protected against them, and have dominion over them; but it was evidently not the dominion of brute strength that was planned by the Creator, but the superior power of moral and spiritual force.

God put into man's hands no puny human weapons of offence and defence, but armed him with that mighty controlling force which is not well-known among us to-day, alas! We have lost the power, but in those far-away days when "man walked with God" it was different.

Perfect man and perfect woman were God's first human creations; living souls endowed with perhaps divine attributes, and

invested with such spiritual power as would ensure to them complete dominion over "every living thing that moveth upon the earth;" and it was in this sense that man was given dominion over God's creatures.

Briefly, there is absolutely no evidence to show that the practice of killing certain animals for food purposes is anything more than a man-made practice that was born of human cravings and fed by man's insatiable appetite.

In the old, old days, when the fathers of the human race, walked the earth as primitive men, they found that the flesh of some of the animals was good, and they slew them as we do to-day without let or hindrance. They were not troubled in those days by such questions as "Meum and Tuum," ethics and religion, right and wrong; nor were they swayed by such sentimental reasons as humane considerations, mercy, compassion, and the rest of it.

The nomadic life of the Israelites under Moses rendered the cultivation of vegetables, as we know it to-day, an impossibility. Sheep, goats, and oxen were plentiful; they carried their flocks and herds with them; here was convenient form of food; and as there was no other available, these animals necessarily formed the staple food of the people. The only thing Moses and the rulers of Israel could do was to curb, as far as it was wise and politic to do so, the lusts and appetites of the people; and their efforts in this direction found expression in the elaborate system of laws and regulations found in the Pentateuch.

But the domestic animals were no more *given* to these ancient peoples in those far-away times than they are given to us in these days. The practice of eating animal food was initiated by man probably at a time when the economic conditions under which he lived were excessively hard. Food was scarce and the grossest ignorance prevailed as to the highly nutritive value of many vegetable products which no doubt existed then as now. If man under such conditions, therefore, took such means of subsistence as were ready to hand, there are certainly many excuses for him; indeed he had no choice in the matter; it was animal food or starvation; and the common law of self-preservation dictated which alternative to take.

In consideraing the contention that "domestic animals being the property of the owners man has a perfect right to kill them and use their flesh as food," we should bear in mind one or two points. When we speak of *rights*, we should not forget that there are rights of many kinds. There are legal and moral rights, rights in equity and in law, just rights and unjust rights, the right of might, right of dominion and power, and so on *ad infinitum*. By which of these rights is the question we are considering to be decided.

If we attempt to settle it on the ground that these animals are ours by the legal right of inheritance, the analytical mind of an able lawyer would at once look into our title and trace it back and back till he came to those far-off days when our ancestors took their animals by right of might, and although he would admit that custom has established a right, he would at the same time tell us that our title was faulty inasmuch as our ancestors obtained their possessions by force.

Let us draw a parallel between this case and that of many of the great families of our own country, or, for that matter, of any country in Europe. The landed possessions of many of the great ones of the earth are vast and yield great revenues. They are firmly established in them, and the law of the country recognises their proprietorship. Nobody to-day brothers himself about the equity of their titles; the land is theirs; it has descended for generations from heir to heir, and that is enough.

But trace back the history of some of these lords of the earth; go back generation by generation; back of those days when strife was rife, and breast-plate and morion, sword and spear, were important factors in the formation of family estates and the upbuilding of family names.

Go back to those "good old days" when "barons held their sway" and serfdom was the portion of the people; to those fine old times when the strong hand took what it wanted and held what it took; when kings confiscated the estates to those who opposed them, and distributed them with lavish hand among courtiers and flatterers; gave any with unstinted generosity that which was not theirs to give, and enriched those who had no right to receive, save the right which might gives.

You shall find that had not time sanctioned the title it would have been found of so faulty a nature that no court of justice of to-day would uphold it. And you would realize in this case, as in the other, that many an owner of inherited estates has no more equitable, just, moral right to his property than has the man who claims the right of taking the lives of living creatures.

The right of *possession*, the right of *might*—both being legalised by man-made laws and by custom—are his; but man's laws are not God's laws, and although man finds it easy enough to justify himself before earthly judges, his conscience must tell him that he cannot and will not be able to offer justification before that High Tribunal which takes no cognizance of such human laws as are not framed in justice and equity, and administered in mercy and compassion.

In considering the second point, that "the human teeth are evidently intended for flesh food," we should not too readily accept all that people say in this world. Many an apologist for meat-eating will be found to defend the practice on the grounds of man's teeth being those of the carnivora; whereas, as a matter of fact they are nothing of the kind. One writer says:—

"The physical structure of man is declared by our most eminent biologists to reveal the indisputable fact that he is at the present day, as he was thousands of years ago, naturally a frugivorous (fruit-eating) animal . . . . . The accepted scientific classification places man with the anthropoid apes, at the head of the highest order of mammals. These animals bear the closest resemblance to human beings, their teeth and internal organs being practically identical with those of man, and in a natural state they subsist almost entirely upon nuts, seeds, and fruit."

There is, besides this testimony, overwhelming scientific evidence forthcoming of man being of the frugivorous order of mammals (see "The Testimony of Science in favour of Natural and Humane Diet," published by The Order of the Golden Age,) and if those who follow the practice of partaking of flesh food, because they believe they belong to the carnivorous order, will not look into the question for themselves, then they must bear the charge of deliberately shutting their eyes to facts.

Man is *not* of the order of carnivorous animals, and no amount of sophistical jugglery can prove him to be so. He is declared by the most eminent authorities to be of the frugivorous order, and if, after science has spoken, man persists in his carnivorous practices, he will do so because he lusts after the flesh of God's inoffensive creatures, and not because he believes he was intended by his Creator to be a meat-eater.—*The Herald of the Golden Age.*

A VETERAN ORIENTALIST.

DR. G. U. POPE.

The London correspondent of the *Times of India* writing under date April 20th says:—

In commemoration of the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, the Royal Asiatic Society established a Gold Medal to be awarded every third year to some specially selected *savant* of repute by whose labours Oriental learning has been encouraged amongst English-speaking people throughout the world. The time for this triennial award has once more come round and the choice has fallen on that eminent Tamil scholar, the Rev. G. U. Pope. Mr. Pope is remarkably

well preserved for his age. He was born 86 years ago, almost to a day, in Nova Scotia, where his family then resided. He completed his education at the Hoxton College, being designed for the Wesleyan ministry, and went out to Southern India in 1839. He joined the Church of England, and was employed under the auspices of the S. P. G. in Tinnevelly, where he first learned to know and love the Tamil people, language and literature. On his temporary return to England in 1849, he made his first acquaintance with Oxford, where he was the guest and occasional Chaplain to the great and good Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, to whom, he is wont to say, he owes very much of what he most values in life. On his return to India in 1851 he was appointed to Tanjore, where he saw a new phase of native life and character. From that time Indian education engaged very much of his attention, and he was able to found the Tanjore College, which, under a succession of able men, has taken a prominent place in the educational work of Southern India. He had had some tuitional experience in Tinnevelly where he began what has developed into the chief educational centre of the S. P. G. Missions there, *viz.*, in Sawyerpuram. His pupils, their children and their grandchildren, are scattered pretty nearly wherever Tamil Native Christians are to be found. Mr. Pope afterwards laboured at Ootacamund and Banglore, and finally left India in 1880. He has mostly resided in Oxford, where he received the degree of M. A., having previously been made a D. D. by the Archbishop of Canterbury. He has been chaplain of his College (Balliol) for nearly twenty years, but his chief work in the Uuiversity has been teaching Tamil and Telugu to the accepted candidates of the Indian Civil Service, large numbers of whom have passed through his hands and hold the venerable scholar in affectionate esteem. For their use he has published a series of elementary books. He has also written a text-book of Indian history, and has translated many of the Tamil sacred writings. A scheme is now on hand for the publication of a complete Tamil Dictionary on the foundation of those in use, introducing as far as possible modern improvements. A specimen sheet and prospectus may soon be expected, and very many influential persons are interested in the project. Mr. Pope does not expect, at his advanced age, to do more than set the work going, but he has accumulated a large amount of material which in competent hands will suffice to make a complete and sufficient dictionary. "Who's Who" states that Mr. Pope's recreation is "Tamil," but it may also be said that he is a poet of no mean order, and has rendered most sympathetically into English some of the sonnets of Goethe, Victor Hugo and other famous foreign authors.

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

ADVERTISING RATES.

THE JOURNAL HAS A CIRCULATION

Throughout India, Burma, The Straits, Ceylon and European Countries.

One insertion	... ...	Rs.	5	a page
Two insertion	... ...	,,	7½	,,
Three ,,	... ...	,,	10	,,
Six ,,	... ...	,,	20	,,
Twelve ,,	... ...	,,	30	,,

Wanted active Agents to Canvass subscribers for the "Siddhanta Deepika" throughout India, Straits, Burma and Ceylon and also European Countries. Liberal Commission.

The Age of Manickavachakar.

This is a pamphlet containing various points of absorbing interest to the Saivas; it will also serve as a good guide to the Student of the ancient classics of Tamil Literature.

Wrapper ... ... Re. **1 0 0**

TREE OF KNOWLEDGE

OF

Good and Evil

By J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, B.A., B.L.

Price As. 4 only.

This book furnish a solution to the much disputed question, what the Biblical Tree of knowledge is."

The sound logical and well argued sentiments of the author fully illumine the subject and convince the reader of the truth expressed.

Christians entering into controversies will find rich materials.

Only a few copies on hand.

Panniru Tirumurai Thirattu.

பன்னிருதிருமுறைத்திரட்டு
திருவாசகத்துக்கு 60 விஷய
சூசனங்களும்,
250 வேதப்பிரமாணங்களும்.

Containing Thevaram, Tiruvachakam, Tirukovaiyar, &c., with commentaries for the difficult passages, &c., &c.

Royal 12mo. pp. 528, full calico bound with gilt title. Price Rs. 1-12-0 per copy. Postage and V. P. extra. Apply to

S. SIVA ARUNAGIRI MUDALIAR,
56, Nammalwar Street, Sowcarpet,
MADRAS.

(Please mention this paper while ordering.)

Siva Keetha.

சிவகீதை

BEING A TRANSLATION FROM SANSCRIT

BY

BRAHMA SRI GANESA SASTRIAR

and Astavadanam

Puvai KALIANASUNDRAM MUDALIAR,

To be published in parts. Price of each part is 6 as. Intending Subscribers will apply for registration of their names to

K. JAMBULINGA MUDALIAR,
36, Irulappan Street, Elephant Gate,
Sowcarpet Post, Madras.

(Please mention this paper while ordering.)

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

Gentlemen who give Rs. 100 and upwards will be styled Patrons to The Siddhanta Deepika and the journal will be supplied free to all Patrons.

PATRONS.

His Highness the Maharaja of Travancore

Sreeman T. Vedadrisadasa Mudaliar Avergal,

Retired High Court Judge of Travancore.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS TO THE

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

1. Subscription. Yearly Rs. 4 India; 7 Shillings foreign.
2. Single Copy. Price Annas 6.
3. Subscriptions are strictly payable in advance.
4. Subscriptions entered to begin with only April of each year and to close with March of the next year.
5. Enrolled subscribers may not withdraw except at the end of the volume.
6. Subscriptions cannot be closed in the middle of a volume. All notices for discontinuance are to be given in the beginning of the new year, i.e., in April for otherwise one should have to pay for the whole of the current volume. Outstanding subscriptions are often realised by V. P. P. to prevent accumulation of arrears.
7. Non-receipt of issues must be complained of within the end of the month in which the magazine is issued.
8. Change of address must be duly notified.